

ILLINOIS U LIBRARY
FEBRUARY 13, 1951
(651st BROADCAST)

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 287 Stations of the ABC Network

S. Pat. Off.



Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

Is Television an Asset or Liability to Education?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

CHARLES A. SIEPMANN TELFORD TAYLOR
RALPH W. HARDY

Interrogators

ROBERT J. LANDRY EDWIN A. FALK



THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"How Can Modern Man Find Faith?"

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 42



\$5.00 A YEAR; 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 16 No. 42



Is Television an Asset or Liability to Education

The Broadcast of February 13, 1951, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EST, on the American Broadcasting Network, originated in Hotel Commodore, New York City, under the auspices of the Rochester Institute of International Affairs on the occasion of the 35th Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from record made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statement of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

TELFORD TAYLOR—Counsel to the Joint Committee on Educational Television. Mr. Taylor has held various legal positions in the Federal Government, ending as General Counsel to the Federal Communications Commission, May 1940 to October 1942. During the first Nuremberg trial, he acted as Deputy to Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson. In October 1946 he succeeded Justice Jackson as Chief of Counsel for War Crimes, a position he retained throughout the Nuremberg trials. He resigned both from that position and from the army on August 15, 1949 with the rank of brigadier general. Mr. Taylor is now practicing law in New York City.

CHARLES A. SIEPMANN—A naturalized citizen of the United States. Mr. Siepmann was born in Bristol, England. In 1937 a Rockefeller Foundation fellowship brought him to this country to study and report on broadcasting over educational stations. Previously he had been with the British Broadcasting Corporation for 12 years. During World War II Mr. Siepmann worked with the O.W.I. and in 1945 he served as consultant to the F.C.C. Since 1946 he has been Professor of Education and Chairman of the Department of Communications in Education at New York University. He is the author of *Radio's Second Chance and Radio, Television and Society*.

RALPH W. HARDY—Director of the Department of Government Relations of the National Association of Broadcasters. In 1937 Mr. Hardy joined Radio Station KSL, Salt Lake City, where he served in several capacities, ending as assistant general manager. He was appointed a member of the NAB National Program Managers Committee in 1944. Today Mr. Hardy represents the NAB as both Director of the Department of Government Relations and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Advertising Council. He has recently been appointed a member of the Advertising Advisory Committee of Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer.

Interrogators

ROBERT J. LANDRY—Editor of "Space and Time;" original Radio Editor of *Variety*; and Director of the New York University Summer Radio Workshop for the past nine years.

EDWIN A. FALK—Counsel for the Television Broadcasters Association and General Counsel to Allen B. Dumont Laboratories, Inc.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by Town Hall, Inc., New York 18, New York. Send subscription and single copy order to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1951, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

Is Television an Asset or Liability to Education?

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Tonight we are happy to be the guests of the National Association Secondary School Principals, one of the strongest professional organizations in this country, under whose auspices we made our first out-of-town appearance in Cleveland in March of 1939. These are the men and women who are largely responsible for what is taught, and how it is taught, in the high schools throughout our land. A great many of them are already making extensive use of radio in their schools, including America's Town Meeting on the Air. A few have begun to use television.

Now the purpose of our program, tonight, is to examine freely and frankly the possibilities of television in the field of education, particularly in our schools. We welcome the counsel this evening

Ralph W. Hardy, Director of Government Relations for the National Association of Broadcasters; Dr. Charles A. Siepmann, Professor of Education at New York University; and General Telford Taylor, counsel to the Joint Committee on Educational Television.

We'll hear first from Mr. Ralph W. Hardy, who was a former chairman of the Educational Standards Committee of the National Association of Broadcasters, who began his work in radio in Salt Lake City in 1937. Twelve years later he came to Washington, D.C., to be associated with the National Association of Broadcasters and now represents this association as a member of the Board of Directors of the Advertising Council. Mr. Hardy.

Mr. Hardy:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. When you witness the singular power of television to make children and adults alike laugh and cry and think and act, you cannot help but be awestruck by the tremendous potentialities of this great new facility of communication. I hope Dr. Siepmann and General Taylor can agree with me that if educators were to turn their backs on television they would be literally walking out on the greatest teaching tool ever put in the hands of man.

Looking back for a point of comparison, I believe that far too many of our colleagues in the academic world felt about radio when it appeared, about the way old Scrooge did in sizing up Marley's ghost, "It's humbug. I won't believe it." Radio's apparition, instead of turning out, and I again quote from Scrooge, "as an undigested bit of beef, a blot of mustard, a crumb of cheese, or a fragment of an underdone potato," has grown to a potent reality, exerting a great force in our way of life.

Now television is here with us, clamoring for understanding, thoughtful attention, and wise application in meeting our needs and wants. Our problem seems to me to be essentially one of how can we put education to work for television. We must not lose sight of the fact that there are no program ideas in camera chains or any of the other electronic devices that are television. These come about only when the creative genius of man gives form, movement, tone, and purpose to visual as well as audible images that themselves have the

power to attract and motivate people.

I'm asked the question, "If educators produce good television programs will local stations and networks carry them?" The answer ultimately rests with the individual licensees of the television stations. These are the people selected by the Federal Communications Commission from among all of the qualified applicants as being best suited to operate their television facilities in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. I think, broadly speaking, the answer would be yes, with accent on good programs.

General Taylor, recently, led a most imposing column of educators in a hearing before the FCC in Washington to request a reservation of television channels to guarantee their opportunity, as educators, to get into television at some future date—say 30 years hence. I join my associates in the commercial broadcasting industry who generally regard such a setting aside and non-use of television frequencies for an extended period of time as a waste of a great national resource, particularly when scarcity looms as such an important factor for the foreseeable future.

It is to be hoped that educators who seriously contemplate the use of television will not take refuge in the philosophy that educational programs must always appeal to small, selective audiences. The basic challenge, as I see it, is not alone how to get more education out to the already highly educated, but rather, more importantly, how to share the blessings of knowledge and enlightenment with all who invest time before a television receiver.

You know I like to think of professors like Dr. Siepmann worrying

about their Hooper rating. Some how or other I fancy that the techniques of education could much more easily adapted now to television if that kind of worry had been more a part of the technique of teaching processes through the years.

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Hardy. Well, to guarantee your, and Professor Siepmann's, Hooper rating will go up tonight. Our next speaker, a professor of Education and Chairman of the Department of Communications at New York University, part author of what is known in radio circles as the "Blue Book" issued by the Federal Communications Commission in 1945. He is a naturalized American citizen, who came to this country in 1937 on a Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship after having served for 11 years with the British Broadcasting Corporation in several important capacities. During the war he was Deputy Director of the San Francisco office of the OWI. He has written many articles and several books on radio, the most recent a provocative book entitled *Radio, Television, and Society*. We are happy to welcome to Town Meeting, Dr. Charles A. Siepmann.

Dr. Siepmann:

Thank you, Mr. Denny. I have mixed feelings about television. I don't share the enthusiasm of those who, like General Taylor, think it is a priceless tool of education in our classrooms. For my money its price is too high.

Its unique power is to dispense with space—to have us all in the front row at a president's inauguration, at a meeting of the United Nations, or whatever. But for classroom purposes this, I think, has

only marginal significance. I doubt, moreover, whether television has much to offer schools and colleges that films can't offer with advantages. You can show a film when and where you want it. You can't with television. You can preview films. You can't preview television. Functionally, as well as cost-wise, films, as I see it, have it over television.

Television, in fact, is low on my list of priorities for school and college education. Long before we get it I want provision made for better teachers, more rigorously trained and better paid. I want smaller classes and more and better equipment for our children's use.

I want a profession that men, as well as women, will find it harder to get into and prouder to be in—a profession, too, that allows a man to raise a family without mortgaging his underwear.

When the words we utter about education stem from a deep conviction that it is, in fact, what we now merely say it is—the first condition of an enlightened democracy—we'll have money enough to take television and its high costs comfortably in stride. When national expenditure on drink, and sports, and gambling is less than that on education, instead of 3, 5, and 6 times as much, I'll say amen to television. Till then, it seems to me, we have sterner business on our hands. I won't be distracted by the lure of what, at best, I regard as a convenient luxury.

Now when it comes to television as an influence outside the classroom, I have a different song to sing. And here, I guess, I clash with Mr. Hardy. In this context I regard it now, and even more so in the future, as a liability. I see developing basically because of

its cost of operation, as almost exclusively a medium of mass entertainment, with the accent on mass.

It will, in other words, compound all of radio's many felonies; eschew the long term cultural view in the interest of quick returns on sponsor's money; mirror quality by the quantity of audience response; sell cultural minority short and give art, intelligence, and excellence the silent treatment. Left to itself, commercial television is likely to turn us all into a race physically distinguished by a hyperthyroid look about the eyes and fannies flattened by excessive hours in easy chairs; a nation of passive gapers instead of active intelligences, credulous instead of critical; mass-minded instead of individual; more and more dependent on outside stimulus and progressively devoid of inward resources. And we shall continue to see our children graduate prematurely to the immaturity of their elders.

Nothing, I believe, will save us from this fate except the reservation of channels in television devoted exclusively to education in the true sense of that word and operated by men and women wholly dedicated to that end. In radio or television or education, I remain convinced that you can't serve God and Mammon. None of us, in the last analysis, can escape that choice.

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dr. Charles Siepmann. Now our next speaker is representing those educators who want to reserve a television channel in each metropolitan area exclusively for educational institutions. General Telford Taylor is a native of Schenectady, New York, a graduate of Williams College and Har-

vard Law School, who has held various legal positions in the government, ending as general counsel with the Federal Communications Commission, May, 1940, to October, 1942.

During the war he served in the Intelligence Service in England and on the continent. During the first Nuremberg trials, General Taylor acted as Deputy to Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson and succeeded him as Chief Counsel for the later trials. He is now practicing law in New York City and is counsel for the Joint Committee on Educational Television. We are happy to welcome to Town Meeting, General Telford Taylor.

General Taylor:

My view is that television is a tremendous potential asset to education. I stress the word "potential" because I agree with Dr. Siepmann that television programs today contain very little which can be said to have true educational value. I believe that television's value in the schoolroom has already been demonstrated by the fine work being done in the public schools, especially in Baltimore and Philadelphia. But education does not begin and end in the classroom and school television is only part of the total problem of educational television.

I have no doubt that educational programs will find an audience, despite the competition of commercial programs. There is a large potential radio and television audience, and many segments of taste, which commercial programs do not touch. The Hooper and other radio surveys are very enlightening, not only because they tell us how many people listen to particular programs, but because they show that a great many people don't

listen to any programs at all, or very few. I think that education television will greatly expand the television audience because of its ability to appeal to those who are not listening or watching now.

An educational television program does not have to be announced, or labeled as such, in order for it to have educational value. This very program is a good example. I didn't hear the Town Crier say anything about education, but I hope that it will serve to inform and enlighten in the best tradition of education. Therefore, while I do believe that television will be a most useful adjunct to education, the far more important thing is that education will be a good thing for television.

We need far greater variety, imagination, and breadth of appeal in children's programs which are broadcast in after-school hours, and in the programs broadcast for the general audience in the evenings. We need programs especially designed for the agricultural areas and other large, but special groups.

A few months ago, an advertisement, urging parents to buy television sets, attracted considerable public attention. Because it suggested that our children would become dyspeptic and neurotic unless there is a television receiver in the home. I hope we can all agree that it is at least equally important that they do not become neurotic from watching television once the receiver is purchased.

To summarize, my objection to the type of programming we have today on commercial radio and television is not so much an objection to what is there, but what is not there. For these shortcomings, I don't blame the advertisers or the network executives.

I can't go along with Mr. Landry because I think these shortcomings are inherent in the whole system of supporting radio and television by commercial advertising.

I think that the establishment of television stations supported by universities or municipalities or foundations offers the most promising way of filling these gaps, and reaching many potential listeners and viewers who find very little interest in the commercial programs. For these reasons I support the reservation of television channels for educational use.

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, General Taylor. Since I spoke of a definition of education, I hope we shall not concur in our views of education, the way a certain bureaucrat in the Empire State Building did in 1945, when they refused to give us gas rationing for our car to make trips across the country to put on these programs, because he said we were teachers in classrooms. I think we have a different concept of what education is.

Tonight we are very happy to have on our panel of questioners, expert questioners, Mr. Robert J. Landry, original radio editor of "Variety" and former director of program writing at CBS, now editor of the advertising newsletter, "pace and Time," and Mr. Edwin

Falk, prominent New York attorney, who is counsel for the Television Broadcasters Association and general counsel to Allen B. Dumont Laboratories. We will have a question from Mr. Landry first.

Mr. Landry: Mr. Hardy, let's get one thing straight. You represent the Broadcasters Association.

Mr. Hardy: That's correct.

Mr. Landry: One of your colleagues recently said, publicly, that educational radio during the past 25 years had been a dismal failure. Do you agree with your colleague?

Mr. Hardy: In the first place you have lifted Dr. Baker's statement completely out of its context. Dr. Baker's statement, which was made in hearings in Washington, was that educational radio, with one or two exceptions, has been a dismal failure in living up to the full potentialities of the medium. I wouldn't have said it the same way Dr. Baker did. No.

Mr. Falk: Dr. Siepmann, isn't calling television a liability, because of some poor programs, like calling the printing press a liability, because of all the trash that's published?

Dr. Siepmann: I'm not sure. . . . Yes, I think that's a fair point.

Mr. Landry: I have a question for Mr. Hardy. Taking a broad historical perspective of Milton Berle in his role as Uncle Milty, do you think this is a net social advance over Uncle Don?

Mr. Hardy: Mr. Moderator, I find that a very difficult question to answer. I have no opinion on that.

Mr. Falk: General Taylor, haven't educators made relatively little use of radio and television channels that they've had, or could have had for the asking?

General Taylor: You said radio and television. Let's take the radio first. In the frequency modulation field, where there has been a reservation for education, there have been, in fact, 67 educational stations, compared to, I think, 82 commercial, which I think is a very fair showing indeed. In television, as you probably know, there has been a freeze on new

applications for about a year and a half.

Mr. Landry: Dr. Siepmann, to recall the historic facts, I think there were some 200 radio stations licensed through time to educational institutions, of which number only about 30 remain in the hands of educators. Now would you favor a restriction on any educational television station licensed, forbidding the subsequent sale of that station to commercial interests?

Dr. Siepmann: No, I wouldn't. I think the commercial stations and the educational stations should stand on a par in that respect and live up to their responsibilities and forfeit their license where they fail.

Mr. Falk: General Taylor, hasn't Iowa State College attracted viewers to its television station by means of commercial network programs?

General Taylor: Yes, that is true. The situation, there, is that there is only one television station in that area, and I think quite rightly, in such a situation, the facility ought to be used for both educational and commercial purposes. Where you have more than one station, of course, it's quite another problem.

Mr. Landry: I have a question for General Taylor again. In New York, I believe, and in Los Angeles, Columbus, Ohio, and Bloomington, Indiana, all of the television stations are already assigned. In other words, nobody can go into the television broadcasting business in those cities. Now this condition, it seems to me, would undoubtedly be true all over the country, at the present time, except for the fact that an engineering mistake, on the part of the FCC, delayed the granting

of further licenses. I ask this question—is this engineering blunder of the FCC probably not the greatest asset that ever happened to American public in broadcasting?

General Taylor: Well, the situation in those cities you've mentioned is precisely the reason why we think a reservation is necessary. In places like Los Angeles, New York—the biggest cities where the most money is immediately available for a purpose like this—the difficulty is that there are the very places where the channels have already been filled before that opportunity can be capitalized. That's precisely why we think a reservation is necessary.

Mr. Falk: Dr. Siepmann, under our free enterprise system, shouldn't television programs have to depend upon voluntary public acceptance and not upon whether some special group may think that the public should have?

Dr. Siepmann: I'm not sure that I get the point of your question. Are you comparing it with the prospect of educational broadcasting?

Mr. Falk: I'm comparing it with a system such as there is in England in the British Broadcasting Company, where the government decides, indirectly it may be true, what the public should receive.

Dr. Siepmann: Oh, if you're asking me whether I prefer the British system of broadcasting to our own, as a system, I'd say I think what we want to do is to make our commercial system work. That can only be done by holding the licensees to the responsibilities they carry by operation of the FCC, that really keep them to their task.

Mr. Falk: Isn't what they will do and will support under our enterprise system the best test?

Dr. Siepmann: If you'll tell me what the American people want of radio, I'll buy it. Nobody has yet done that, neither Nielsen nor Hooper nor anybody else.

General Taylor: I think this whole business of what they want demonstrates that total confusion that there is a thing called a mass. A mass is composed of groups with all kinds of different interests and tastes and you can't just take a mass and say that's typical of the American people. There is a wide variety of tastes and that's precisely why you ought to have a different economic base for part of the television spectrum.

Mr. Falk: Well, I want to ask whether these gentlemen don't think that the professional analysts, engaged by the commercial stations, are doing everything possible to determine what the public wishes are?

Dr. Siepmann: I think they are doing what they can but I think they are making a very poor business of it. You simply can't take mass and treat it in those terms.

What they leave out is the significant fact that is never disclosed in Hooper ratings, namely, that at most hours of the day there are more people with their sets tuned out than with their sets tuned in.

Mr. Landry: I'd like to make this point. It seems to me apropos this question of whether the people get what they want. Given a completely different array of choices, they would make completely different choices. This is the fact that is typically overlooked.

General Taylor: I just want to indicate previous agreement with that. That is precisely again why you will meet this greater variety of tastes and desires if you have different types of sponsorship for programs, not all based on advertising, but some based on other foundations.

Mr. Denny: All right, now there is a great body of people standing here in the aisles ready to ask questions, representatives of this National Association of Secondary School Principals. We'll start with a question from the gentleman here.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Man: Mr. Hardy, what aid and stimulation can be given to television to hurry it through the growing pains stage such as radio experienced in the 1920's?

Mr. Hardy: I think the answer to that question is one which can be found in our encouraging, not only on the school level, but on the home level, much higher degree of selectivity in listening and developing the characteristic of making our wants and wishes known, with a greater degree of articulation, to the broadcasters.

Lady: Dr. Siepmann, since tele-

vision station owners are in business for money, do you advocate government support to present programs designed for enlightened public education?

Dr. Siepmann: Yes, precisely what I suggest. I have no hopes of commercial broadcasting in television achieving the ends of education and I think we shall need subsidy of some kind, whether from foundations, universities, or even government subsidy. I'll buy the lot.

Man: Mr. Hardy, may educators anticipate funds, comparable to

those contributed by commercial concerns, to insure support of programs that are educationally sound for the youth of America?

Mr. Hardy: I'll have to ask you a clarifying question. Funds from what source?

Man: From any source that would underwrite the programs which we think to be educationally sound.

Mr. Hardy: Well, that's a question that I haven't the answer for. It's a question which educators must look at realistically when they talk about supporting the colossal expenses of operating television with the funds available to educators, such as from state legislatures, from foundations and other groups. The answer to that is undetermined to date, in my judgment.

General Taylor: I think . . . Of course, the answer is undetermined, but here we have a country which is studded with gymnasiums and stadiums and libraries and dormitories, and there's no reason why television shouldn't begin to get a place in the sun here. This is going to have a more profound effect on the mind and thought of America than many other things from time to come now, and we have to put educational foundation funds into this kind of work.

Man: Dr. Siepmann, what can be done by school people to cause a sponsor to present more educational programs, rather than entertaining ones?

Dr. Siepmann: I think there's a tremendous job for education to do to build up its audiences through the school systems; the encouragement of effective listening, and selective listening, among their students; the encouragement of correspondence; the organization of listening groups or viewing groups throughout the country

to express the will of the public in terms of its differential character, rather than in the terms of a mass, as it is now treated.

Man: General Taylor, are the problems in 1951 television programs better resolved by legislation or education?

General Taylor: Well, I think myself they are better resolved by new economic base for part of the spectrum, as I've said. There is, of course, room here for the Commission to do what it can to increase the variety in programming. But I think that is a more controversial and, in the long run, less promising way to handle things than by bringing a new element into the picture.

Man: Mr. Hardy, in terms of young children being unable to make proper evaluations due to the popular appeal, what is the educational value of the Hopalong Cassidy and other type western crime plays for very young children?

Mr. Hardy: Well, I again come back to an answer which I partially made a few moments ago. In my own judgment, and I speak now as the father of four children, we make a great mistake when we permit television to enter our homes in a situation that amounts to a vacuum, where you have nothing else in terms of guidance, or make no further efforts to make sure that the experiences, that may be stimulated by virtue of their viewing television, have a proper counterbalance in other of the worthwhile activities that give us broad educational backgrounds.

Man: Dr. Siepmann, we have failed to teach children and even adults discretion in movies and radio. Is there any reason to believe that television will be any different?

Dr. Siepmann: Not unless we

change ourselves and radically modify our practices, within the schools, by bringing these things into a relationship to teaching that bears on life.

Man: Mr. Hardy, how can public opinion be mobilized to persuade sponsors to present programs of a better educational quality?

Mr. Hardy: Well, again a question partially touched on. The most effective way I know of getting the wants and wishes of the public down to an advertiser is to communicate directly with that advertiser, and I've said to many radio groups and television groups, "you have no idea of the potency of a well-phrased letter or postcard."

Man: General Taylor, the televising of United Nations sessions last year was an extremely valuable service. What would be the effect of televising sessions of our regular public bodies?

General Taylor: Well, I think the effect would be very good and very enlightening. The difficulty of course, that the amount of time devoted to those United Nations broadcasts tended to diminish the amount of sold time increased. The margin diminished and there was less United Nations on the air. That's the same problem that would apply in the case you suggest.

Mr. Falk: Dr. Siepmann, you said that films can do just about anything that television could do. Isn't there a tremendous value in showing young people and old people on many occasions a situation, the outcome of which nobody can be certain of, while it's actually happening?

Dr. Siepmann: Yes, indeed. I don't decry the value of television in that respect. All I was trying to say was that, if you see the problem of education, of our time, in true perspective, the distribu-

tion of the monies that we have is ill-distributed if we concern ourselves with television when there is so much else of greater importance that needs attention before our schooling is what it should be.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you. Now I want to ask the questioners to please remember that television doesn't exist exclusively for educators or for educational purposes. Let's remember that it's essentially an entertainment medium at the present time and so is radio. Let's at least focus this thing realistically and not just think of it as a tool of education. Next question?

Lady: I believe Mr. Taylor said, in his introductory remarks, that he isn't as much worried about the present television as the future possibilities of it. I was looking at a wrestling match the other night and a very risqué comment was made by the announcer. Can there be any control similar to those governing other means of communication?

General Taylor: Well, let me first make clear that what I meant to say in my introductory remarks was that I think that television programs, at present, contain very little of educational value and it is the potential that I am hopeful of. Of course, the question you raise about risqué remarks is one that is within the control of the Commission, which has the authority to prevent that kind of abuse of the air.

Man: Mr. Hardy, who will subsidize educational television channels when education today has financial difficulties?

Mr. Hardy: Well, again you're asking a man in the commercial field how the educators are going to get finances necessary for their operation, and I come back again, as I did a few moments ago, and

say that's a very realistic question. We had it come up before our hearing in Washington, in which, to pose a typical situation, how will the state legislature feel in appropriating, modestly, shall we say, \$300,000 for the erection of a television station which will serve but one community of an entire state. Those are the kind of practical problems that educators must look at when they begin talking about paying television's tremendous bill with funds contributed from state legislatures, from local communities, from foundations.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Hardy, while you're here give us an answer to a question of fact. What does it cost, roughly, to operate . . . to erect a station and how much a year does it cost to operate it? A television station.

Mr. Hardy: I can't give you too accurate figures. . . .

Mr. Denny: Roughly.

Mr. Hardy: Roughly, I'd say the minimum cost of erecting a television station would be in the neighborhood of three to five hundred thousand dollars, and the operating cost would depend a good deal on the nature of the program material. So likewise, I hasten to add, will the size and content of the audience.

Mr. Landry: I'd like to comment on both what Mr. Hardy just said and what Dr. Siepmann said a bit ago. This business of a realistic approach to educational television, it seems to me, is of the essence, and it has been too much brushed off by a lot of speakers, not only here, but elsewhere. Now, for example, back in the early days of radio there was a great deal of talk about philanthropists. They never appeared. Dr. Siepmann mentioned his hope, and I would share the hope, that foundations might come in. But with the

exception of the Rocky Mountain Radio Council in Denver and the Lowell Institute in Boston, I know of absolutely nothing in the way of foundation support in the past, and I wonder whether he has any information that would support him in his confidence.

Dr. Siepmann: I don't know that I expressed any confidence on this point. I expressed a hope. Now I don't know of any agency, at this moment, that is sufficiently apprised of the value of this service to give it the financial backing that it deserves. The only point that I would make would be, that my plea for the reservation of frequencies is based upon the fact that if they are lost now, they are lost forever, and I would prefer to see those saved even if the educators, and those who support them, actually fail in the long run to avail themselves of their franchise. If we lose the frequencies we lose the opportunity of ever seeing education on the air.

Mr. Hardy: I want to respond to this last comment of Dr. Siepmann's. He spoke about frequencies being lost forever. Every person in this audience, in this hall tonight and elsewhere in the country, should know that by the Federal law, under which the Federal Communications Act exercises regulation of broadcasting and television, no license is granted for longer than a period of three years, and that the question of renewal of a any broadcast or television license is subject to the Commission's finding that the renewal of that license will be in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. I suggest that puts a real check on the situation.

Mr. Denny: All right. That you. General Taylor and Dr. Siepmann both want to comment. Now we are getting a real debate.

General Taylor: Yes, I just want to say that, while what Mr. Hardy says about the law is quite true, in tactical fact to take a station off the air, that has a big investment here, is a very difficult thing and never happens. And when the commission tries, the first people that come in and say this is a usurpation of power, are the industrial people.

Mr. Denny: All right, Dr. Siepmann.

Dr. Siepmann: Nothing but men to what General Taylor said.
Lady: Mr. Hardy. Would it be advisable to televise all the sessions of Congress or part of them to make a better informed electorate?

Mr. Hardy: May I say that if you had asked me that question a year and a half ago, while I was still a resident of Salt Lake City, I would have said yes, it could be wonderful to televise all the sessions of Congress. Having lived in Washington, D.C. now for a year and a half, I'd say for heaven's sake no, or change the pattern of Congress.

Man: To General Taylor. The question has been discussed but needs emphasis. Can the frequency of high class programs be increased if the people who enjoy them are more expressive of appreciation?

General Taylor: Yes, I think they can. And I think the organization of listener groups to express preferences is a very promising thing indeed. I think the answer is yes.

Man: Mr. Hardy, you know the Northwest Ordinance was set up with one section of land reserved out of every township for public education in the future. They didn't know how they were going to use it, but I think what has happened is a good record of what

they did do with it. Would you not be willing to trust education to use this still unknown television situation? Trust them to make judicious use of it in the future without not knowing now exactly how they would use it?

Mr. Hardy: Let me answer your question very specifically that so far as I know my associates in the commercial broadcasting industry think that educational institutions are very fit holders of a license to operate a television station. The comparison you have drawn, however, is one on which I would like to make one point. We talk about these great natural resources in the public domain and the reservation of them. I would like to point out to you that television channels or frequencies are something that do not disappear in the use. They are not wasted in the use. The only way they are wasted is by their non-use.

Mr. Falk: General Taylor, isn't it a fact that any highbrow program can get on the air if the commercial station in question has reasonable grounds for thinking that people want to watch it?

General Taylor: No, I think that's not the answer at all. In deciding whether or not to put it on, they will take account of the commercial needs of the programs that precede and follow; they will take account of how many commercial programs they have to put on to meet their budget, and all kinds of other things. Merely coming forward with a good—as you call it—highbrow program is not the sole answer.

Mr. Denny: Thank you very much, General Taylor, Mr. Hardy, Dr. Siepmann, Mr. Landry, and Mr. Falk for your contributions to tonight's discussion. Plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

On this page we take you "behind the scenes" of America's Town Meeting. We will welcome your questions about the program and your suggestions on what phases interest you most.

Since he founded the program in 1935, George V. Denny, Jr., has wanted America's Town Meeting to be truly representative of America. That is why half our programs each year are broadcast from different cities throughout the country.

Town meeting next week begins its annual spring tour and the program will visit cities in the east and midwest. The February 20th broadcast will be from Fredericksburg, Va., under the auspices of the local Chamber of Commerce and Mary Washington College, the woman's branch of the University of Virginia. On February 27th you will hear the program from Rochester, N. Y., in cooperation with that city's Institute of International Affairs.

Other forthcoming tour broadcasts include:

March 6 — Baltimore (Beth Tfiloh Forum)

March 13 — Syracuse (Citizens Foundation)

April 3—Peoria (Citizens Forum and Bradley University)

April 10—Urbana (Contemporary Arts Festival of the University of Illinois)

Should you reside in or near these cities, you will have an opportunity to attend the broadcast. Watch your local papers for details.

Town Meeting welcomes tour invitations from representative local and national organizations. Hosts for broadcasts in the past have included many colleges and universities, community forums

and groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, League of Women Voters, women's clubs, foreign affairs councils, etc.

In brief, these are the arrangements covering Town Meeting originations:

Our budget does not provide for the added expense of touring—there are three on our own staff plus an ABC producer and engineer. Speakers' traveling expenses also are higher than if the program is broadcast from New York or Washington. We have found from past experience that the actual costs of touring Town Meeting average \$1,000 per broadcast. Therefore, we ask the local auspices to provide that as an origination fee plus the linemen charges (averaging \$100) and the rental of the auditorium.

When Town Meeting comes to town, it is an important event and makes front-page news. The program draws an audience of people from all walks of life. In addition to the fact that the broadcast attracts considerable attention locally, it results in widespread publicity for the city and the sponsoring organization. Every Town Meeting is carried by 28 stations of the ABC network in the United States, Canada, Alaska and Hawaii. Most programs also are beamed 'round the world by the Voice of America.

Inquiries about Town Meeting tour originations should be addressed to our business manager, William R. Traum, at Town Hall, New York 18.

THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

"HOW CAN MODERN MAN FIND FAITH?"

Program of February 6, 1951

S p e a k e r s

Bishop Austin Pardue, Dr. Irwin Edman and
Mr. Fulton Oursler

Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con. The letters should be mailed to Department A, Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y., not later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.

FAITH THROUGH THE WORD AND SPIRIT

Faith, like a car, must have two things to run. If the gas tank is empty or the ignition is not in order, the car will not run regardless of what we do otherwise. So it takes God's word and the Holy Spirit to create faith in humans. . . . Teaching and preaching the word of God, reading and meditating upon it are the first steps. Then the Holy Spirit can do his part in creating faith in us.
REV. KARL FENSKE, Ithaca, Nebraska.

HE WILL OF GOD

I preferred (Mr. Oursler's) statement to that of philosopher humanist Edman or Churchman Pardue. If I had to choose between the other two, I'd take Professor Edman, because even though Bishop Pardue believes in Jesus Christ, he still thinks that God has to be understood through some specific branch of Churchianity; while Professor Edman with his belief in the fulfillment of man is probably closer to God than he knows, or is able to make clear. . . . A truly religious person, one who has faith in God, is one who has come to know Him through the personal experience of facing that great fact,

"of myself I can do nothing". . . . The next wonderful step . . . is "with God all things are possible." This, of course, for the material-minded, degenerates at once into the cultish practices that teach us how to use God so that we may gratify our every wish. Again our loving Father has to demonstrate to us that is not what He meant. Over and over we get little glimpses of God in our lives, and over and over we misapprehend and misappropriate until at last we come to understand it really is God's will that we must do, and not our own. Then begins the mighty task which gives meaning and purpose to our lives. What is it that God wants? Nothing more nor less than that every man shall be free to seek, to find, and to do the will of God, as appointed for him to do so.—MARY HORAN, Los Angeles, California.

(The writer of the above letter is a librarian in the Philosophy and Religion Department of the Los Angeles Public Library)

FAITH THROUGH GUIDANCE

We must renounce materialism before we can find a new faith. . . . (but) with this material world surrounding us, we can't just snap our fingers and say, "I renounce

it." We need guidance in re-establishing our values back to a creative form of life.—AUDREY L. FISHER, Palo Alto, California.

DR. EDMAN'S FAITH

Dr. Edman believes only in faith in oneself, one's own ability to accomplish what he or she may wish to. (This) thought is responsible for the conditions that exist in the world today. Faith in power, armaments, and superiority have not brought peace to this sin-sick world . . . and have not given peace of mind to American citizens. But faith in God will give that quiet peace that we long for. Dr. Edman is a man with an education far superior to many average citizens, but if a higher education blinds one to the power of a living God, I am happy that I do not have it.—MRS. IDELLA GILLARD, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Edman left the impression on me that every person has faith, and to this I agree. We inherit faith. We do not need to find faith, but we can increase it. . . . It is *truth* that the people are in need of, not faith. If they secure truth they will have no trouble obtaining the rest. Jesus did not say faith or belief would make us free . . . but "the truth shall make ye free."—REV. WILLIAM C. MAY, Youngstown, Ohio.

Dr. Edman expressed our convictions with courage and without

beating about the bush. To us it was a matter of the mature mind expressing the thought of the twentieth century against the (other) minds hemming and hawing the thought of medievalism.—MR. AND MRS. EMIL NELSON Evanston, Illinois.

FAITH THROUGH SCIENCE

Modern man can find faith by using the method of modern science, i.e., by collecting his facts, surveying them, adopting a hypothesis to agree with them, and then continually testing the hypothesis. Briefly the facts are: 1) The individual is a self-conscious being endowed with intelligence. 2) He is not self-created or self-sufficient. 3) Existence as he knows it involves a source outside his own identity. 4) In his human contacts he finds need of a practical and satisfactory philosophy or code of relationships and conduct. 5) The problem of a satisfactory answer to his intellectual and ethical needs has been answered in many ways by various philosophies and systems. One complete answer is found in the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth recorded in the New Testament. Study of these teachings unencumbered by ecclesiastical dogmas, and the honest application and testing of them in daily thinking and living will build up and provide a convincing faith, the criterion being satisfactory results.—ERNEST M. QUITTMAYER, Hartford, Connecticut.

ATTENTION, LOCAL DISCUSSION GROUPS!

Do you have a neighborhood or organizational discussion group which meets on Tuesday nights to hear Town Meeting? We are most anxious to hear from discussion group leaders and members. Please write to: Town Meeting Discussion Groups, Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y.